

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claims 1 and 6 have been amended by incorporating therein the subject matter of claims 4 and 8, and to recite that the coloured support is opaque. Accordingly, claims 4-5 have been amended to recite that the coloured opaque support is made from a single ply of paper comprising coloured opacifying pigments in bulk, and from a single ply of paper covered by a precoat of coloured opacifying pigments, respectively, claim 8 has been cancelled, and claim 12 has been amended to recite the subject matter of claim 2. Support for the added recitations is found in the original application, in particular on page 6, lines 7-18 and example 1b.

Also, claims 9-10 have been amended to depend on claim 6 instead of claim 8, and claim 13 has been amended to replace “characterized in that” by “wherein.”

Further, new claims 20-26 have been added. New claims 20 and 23 correspond to original claims 1 and 6 but recite a coloured opaque support made from a single ply of a plastic film covered by a precoat of coloured opacifying pigments. New claim 21 depends on claim 20 and recites a coloured plastic film. New claims 22 and 26 correspond to claim 2 but depend on claims 20 and 23, respectively. New claims 24-25 correspond to claims 18 and 11, respectively, but depend on claim 23. Support for the added recitations is found in the original application, in particular on page 5, line 23.

Claims 1-7 and 9-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 6 are the only independent claims.

As a preliminary, in the Office Action, only claims 1-14 are stated to be under examination. However, a preliminary amendment was submitted with the application on July 23, 2004. Consideration of all pending claims 1-19 in the preliminary amendment is respectfully requested.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 1, 4-6, 8-10, and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by US 3,839,074 to Taylor ("Taylor").

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Taylor relates to a composite film which is comprised of a layer of regenerated cellulose (cellophane) having incorporated therein a titanium dioxide pigment and which is coated along each of the opposite sides with a thermoplastic film-forming resin. One or both of the applied thermoplastic coatings have uniformly dispersed therein an aluminum pigment. The composite film is opaque to visible light due to the titanium dioxide and aluminum pigments which cooperate to reduce the transmission of light through the composite film (see Taylor abstract).

Thus, the support of Taylor is a cellophane film and not a fiber-based paper support, and further, the coating material of Taylor is not white, but aluminum. Taylor is completely silent regarding a precoat.

In contrast, the ultra opaque coated sheet of the present invention comprises a coloured opaque support made from a single ply of paper based on cellulose fibers, as recited in present claims 1 and 6, or from a single ply of a plastic film covered by a precoat of coloured opacifying pigments, as recited in present claims 20 and 23, and in addition, the support of the

present invention is coated on at least one of its faces with one or more white pigmented coats, as recited in present claims 1, 6, 20, and 23. These features make it possible to obtain easily a highly opaque sheet, as explained in the present specification. These features of the presently claimed invention and their advantages are not taught or suggested in Taylor, since Taylor uses a cellophane support and no precoat, and in addition, no white coating. Therefore, the present claims are not anticipated by, and not obvious over, Taylor.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by GB 1,427,485 ("GB'485").

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. GB'485 relates to a synthetic paper for avoiding dusting problems, which consists of a stretched film made from a resin containing filler particles, this film being coated with an aqueous dispersion or solution of a dry-extensible polymeric coating material.

In contrast, in the present invention, the support is made from a paper based on cellulose fibers, as recited in present claims 1 and 6, or a plastic film covered by a precoat of coloured opacifying pigments, as recited in present claims 20 and 23. This feature of the presently claimed invention and its advantages are not taught or suggested in GB'485, which is completely silent as to a fiber-based support or as to a plastic film with a precoat, let alone a precoat of coloured opacifying pigments. Therefore, the present claims are not anticipated by, and not obvious over, GB'485.

Amendment
Serial No. 10/502,446
Attorney Docket No. 042573

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 5-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. It is alleged in the Office Action that “[t]his claim is an omnibus type claim.”

The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is submitted that the rejection is erroneous, because (i) it refers to a single claim as being “omnibus” whereas the rejection includes 10 claims, (ii) claim 5 is itself a dependent claim, so that, if claim 5 were an omnibus claim, claim 1 should also be considered an omnibus claim, and (iii) claims 5-14 are clearly not omnibus claims because they recite specific technical features.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

If there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment
Serial No. 10/502,446
Attorney Docket No. 042573

If this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 44,373

Telephone: (202) 822-1100

Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

NES/rep